

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*[Signature]*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/878, 978 06/19/97 LINDER

S D/97063

WM31/0509

EXAMINER

RONALD ZIBELLI
XEROX CORPORATION
XEROX SQUARE 20A
ROCHESTER NY 14644

POON, K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

[Signature]

DATE MAILED:

05/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/878,978	Applicant(s) Stephen F. Linder
	Examiner King Y. Poon	Art Unit 2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 9, 2001

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the applica

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from considera

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirem

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The term: non neutral object oriented image data, black object oriented image data, grey object oriented image data, and white objected oriented image data, was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It is unclear whether the non neutral object oriented image data, black object oriented image data, grey object oriented image data, and white objected oriented image data are referring to the image data that is created by using object oriented programming, or that the image data would be processed according a particular object.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2624

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phase "may be" in claims 1, 4, 6 is considered to be vague and indefinite because it fails to particularly point out and distinctly claiming whether the image object's neutral object oriented image data are rendered differently from the object's non neutral object oriented image data or not.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 6, 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda et al.

Regarding claim 6: Ueda teaches an object-oriented image processing system, (fig. 1) comprising: a circuit (program step 1000, fig. 2 of CPU 12 abstract, column 4 line 45-60) for parsing composite image data into object-oriented graphic/text image object data, (see image type, column 26 line 1-2, column 5 line 26) wherein object-oriented graphic/text image data comprises image data pertaining to an image object; (image element, column 26 line 1); a parsing circuit (program code 3100, fig. 3 of CPU 12) for parsing the object oriented graphic/text image

Art Unit: 2624

data into non-neutral object oriented text image data (text, fig. 16a) and neutral object-oriented graphic image data; (graphic and photograph, 16a); a neutral rendering transform circuit (program steps fig. 8, of CPU 12, abstract) for transforming a color and color space of the neutral object-oriented graphic image data; (column 26 line 1-3-15); and an image processing circuit (24, fig. 1, 5000, fig. 2, and column 8 line 37-40) for processing the transformed neutral image object-oriented graphic data and the parsed non-neutral image object-oriented text data together, whereby the image object's neutral object-oriented graphic image data may be rendered differently (see vivid/color, normal, enhanced, fig. 19, b) from the object's non-neutral object-oriented text image data.

Regarding claim 10: Ueda teaches that the image object comprises text, graphic, bitmap or photographic. (see photograph, graphic, text, and bitmap, of column 5 line 25 and 35)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. and Matsunawa.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 1, 4: Ueda teaches a system (fig. 1) for processing object-oriented graphic/text image data, (see photograph, graphic, text, and bitmap, of column 5 line 25 and 35) wherein the object-oriented graphic/text image data comprises image data pertaining to an image object, comprising:

a first parser circuit (program step, fig. 3, of CPU 12, abstract) for parsing the object-oriented graphic/text image data into non-neutral object-oriented text image data (text, fig. 16a) and neutral object-oriented graphic image data; (photographic and graphics image, fig. 16a); whereby the object's neutral object-oriented graphic image data is processed separately (column 26 line 1-6, an image element is retrieved and processed by CPU 12) and may be rendered differently (see the images are printed differently according to a printing characteristic, fig. 19b) from the object's non-neutral object-oriented text image data. Ueda also teaches that the neutral image object oriented graphic image data are to be processed by a binarization process (Column 26 line 20-25, column 8 line 8-10) in the neutral rendering transform means, and that the processed neutral object oriented graphic image data and the non neutral object oriented text image are further processed. (See the processed image data would be printed (further processed) to form a composite image, column 8 line 37-40)

Ueda does not teach: a second parser circuit for parsing the neutral object-oriented graphic image data into black object-oriented image data, grey object-oriented image data, and white object-oriented image data; and a neutral color processing circuit for processing the black

Art Unit: 2624

object-oriented image data, the grey object-oriented image data, and the white object-oriented image data.

However, Matsunawa, in the same area of converting a multi-gradation image into binary image (fig. 1b, Matsunawa, column 8 line 5-10, Ueda) teaches to use a parser circuit (11, fig. 18, column 13 line 20-27) to parse the multi-gradation image into black object-oriented image data, (see value 16 of fig. 2, fig. 7b) grey object-oriented image data, (value 2-15, fig. 2, fig. 7b) and white object-oriented image data; (value 0 of fig. 3a, fig. 7b) and a neutral color processing circuit (14, fig. 18, column 13 line 25-32) for processing the black object-oriented image data, the grey object-oriented image data, and the white object-oriented image data, (Fig. 7) such that a binary image is created.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the image processing system of Ueda by providing the system a second parser circuit for parsing the neutral object-oriented graphic image data into black object-oriented image data, grey object-oriented image data, and white object-oriented image data; and a neutral color processing circuit for processing the black object-oriented image data, the grey object-oriented image data, and the white object-oriented image data to carry out the binarization process of Ueda, as taught by Matsunawa. The suggestion of doing so would have benefit the system of Ueda in performing the conversion of multi-gradation images into binary images (column 8 line 5-10) such that an unpleasant strip domain on the halftone portion of the image would be

Art Unit: 2624

eliminated, (column 1 line 43-50, Matsunawa), and at the same time, complex circuitry would also be avoided. (Column 1 line 40-45, line 65-67, Matsunawa)

Regarding claims 3, 5: Matsunawa teaches that the system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the neutral processing circuit processes only the black, grey, and white object-oriented image data according to a selected feature set. (See column 14 line 27-36)

Regarding claim 7: Ueda teaches that the neutral image object oriented graphic image data are to be further processed by a binarization process (Column 26 line 20-25) in the neutral rendering transform means.

Ueda does not teach that the neutral rendering transform means comprises: a neutral parsing means for parsing the neutral image object-oriented graphic data into black object oriented image data, grey object-oriented image data, and white object-oriented image data; and neutral image processing means for processing the black image object-oriented data, the grey object-oriented image data, and the white object-oriented image data.

However, Matsunawa, in the same area of converting a multi-gradation image into binary image (fig. 1b, Matsunawa, column 8 line 5-10, Ueda) teaches to use a parser circuit (11, fig. 18, column 13 line 20-27) to parse the multi-gradation image into black object-oriented image data, (see value 16 of fig. 2, fig. 7b) grey object-oriented image data, (value 2-15, fig. 2, fig. 7b) and white object-oriented image data; (value 0 of fig. 3a, fig. 7b) and a neutral image processing circuit (14, fig. 18, column 13 line 25-32) for processing the black object-oriented image data,

Art Unit: 2624

the grey object-oriented image data, and the white object-oriented image data, (Fig. 7) such that a binary image is created.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the image processing system of Ueda by providing the neutral rendering transform means of Ueda: a neutral parsing means for parsing the neutral object-oriented graphic image data into black object-oriented image data, grey object-oriented image data, and white object-oriented image data; and a neutral image processing circuit for processing the black object-oriented image data, the grey object-oriented image data, and the white object-oriented image data, to carry out the binarization process of Ueda, as taught by Matsunawa. The suggestion of doing so would have benefited the system of Ueda in performing the binarization process such that an unpleasant strip domain on the halftone portion of the image would be eliminated, (column 1 line 43-50, Matsunawa), and at the same time, complex circuitry would also be avoided. (Column 1 line 40-45, line 65-67, Matsunawa)

Regarding claims 8-9: Ueda teaches that the image object comprises text, graphic, bitmap or photographic. (see photograph, graphic, text, and bitmap, of column 5 line 25 and 35)

9. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. and Matsunawa as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Robinson.

Regarding claim 2: Ueda and Matsunawa have disclosed all of the claim limitations as recited in claim 1 except a black processing circuit to process the black object oriented image

Art Unit: 2624

data; a grey processing circuit to process the grey object oriented image data; and a white processing circuit to process the white object oriented image data.

Robinson, in the same area of using processors to process data, teaches the use of different processors to perform different tasks and each processor processes only a specific task. (See column 8 line 1-25) The suggestion of doing so is to improve on the speed and reduce the complexity of real time processor system cause by the use of a single processor to process multiple tasks. (See column 3 line 15-35)

It is for this reason that at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Ueda and Matsunawa's image processing system by having a black processing circuit to process the black object oriented image data; a grey processing circuit to process the grey object oriented image data; and a white processing circuit to process the white object oriented image data, as taught by Robinson. The suggestion of doing so is to improve on the speed and reduce the complexity of real time processor system cause by the use of a single processor to process multiple tasks. (See column 3 line 15-35, Robinson) Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Robinson, Ueda and Matsunawa to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

REMARKS

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Please see office action

Art Unit: 2624

Action is Final, Necessitated by Amendment

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground of rejection presented in this office action. Therefore, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTHS shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892 or to Supervisor Mr. David Moore whose phone number is (703) 308-7452.

May 7, 2001


DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600